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Topics of Discussion

• Reasons for becoming a Reviewer
• How to become a Reviewer
• Expectations from the IJGC of its Reviewers
• Metrics on Reviewer performance
• Items to avoid as Reviewer
• Terms from IJGC for Reviewers
Reasons for Becoming a Reviewer

• Scientific obligation
• Helps to assure that the published literature is novel and of high quality
• Reflect on the quality of this journal
• Learning opportunity for Reviewer
• Reciprocates professional courtesy
• Provides an opportunity for professional growth and promotion
• Global responsibility
• Opportunity to become member of Editorial Board
How to Become a Reviewer

• Contact Lindsey Struckmeyer (ijgc@jjeditorial.com)
• Once invited provide the following:
  - Name
  - Institution
  - Updated contact information
  - Choice of preference topics for review
• Consider inviting friends and colleagues
Expectations from Reviewer

• Timely response to accept or decline review
• Once accepting to review a manuscript:
  - Return completed review within 14 days
  - Provide detailed review that clearly outlines questions or comments
  - Provide detailed review specific to the Authors
  - Provide a brief statement to the Editors regarding your decision
• Reviewer should always declare competing interests and decline such reviews
• Decision to accept or reject manuscript
  Based on the relevance of data to the literature and/or clinical practice, originality of topic addressed, methods and study design, and language clarity
Metrics Reviewer Performance

• Number of review invitations
• Number of review acceptance vs. decline
• Time from invitation to Reviewer decision
• Time from accepting to review to submission of review to journal
• Quality of comments and questions to authors
• Overall rate of decision rendered
  (Accept, Major vs. Minor Revisions, Reject)
Performing a Review

• General Rules on Ethical Aspects
  - Have authors published research before
  - Have authors plagiarized another publication
  - Is the research ethical
  - Has appropriate consent been obtained
  - Is there any indication that data has been fabricated
  - Is there any indication that the data has been manipulated
  - Have authors declared all conflict of interest
Performing a Review

• Express views clearly with supporting arguments and references as necessary
• Provide constructive criticism and an opportunity for the author(s) to provide a response
• Have realistic expectations when requesting additional data or analysis
• Provide specific comments that address gaps or flaws in the study rather than generalized disagreement with the overall principle of the manuscript
• Pose specific questions pertaining to each component of the manuscript (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion)
• Provide very detailed comments to the author(s) with information regarding page and line number
• Base comments on what is the standard of care or general practice in the field rather than your institutional or personal practice
Performing a Review

• **Title Page**
  - Assure that title is consistent with the content and findings of the study
  - Assure that author designation is appropriate to the field of study

• **Abstract**
  - Assure that a clear study objective is provided
  - Confirm that information provided is consistent with the methodology, results, and conclusion of the study
  - Assure that all numbers and statistical reporting is consistent with those found in the Results
  - Confirm that Conclusion is consistent with the data presented and analyzed in the Results
Performing a Review

• **Introduction**
  - Background regarding where the field currently stands should be provided
  - Clear statement regarding the relevance of the subject presented
  - Information as to where the gaps in knowledge lie within that field
  - Clear statement outlining the goals and objectives of the study

• **Methods**
  - Statement confirming that the study was conducted with IRB approval
  - Information on how the data was collected is detailed
  - Information on the type of patients evaluated in the study
  - Specific details on tools and strategies of how study conducted
  - Details on Inclusion and Exclusion criteria
  - Adequacy of methods of statistical analysis
  - Documentation of consent process
  - Registry Number for all prospective trials
Performing a Review

• **Results**
  - All data presented in the Results should reflect what was proposed in the Methods
  - Details should be provided on total number of patients included in the final analysis and total number of exclusions based on exclusion criteria
  - Data should be provided chronologically (demographics, pretreatment, treatment, post-treatment, and outcomes)
  - Assure that all numbers and statistical figures match Abstract and Figures & Tables
  - Assure that Results only contain data reporting and not interpretation
  - Assure that only data that is relevant to the study objective is presented in the Results
  - Assure that when Supplementary Tables and Figures are provided, that data is consistent with that reported in the Results
Performing a Review

• **Discussion**
  - It should begin with a clear and concise statement summarizing the main finding of the study
  - Should not be a repetition of the Results
  - Findings should be compared to those of other studies evaluating similar question (when applicable)
  - There should be a statement that highlights what is offered by the study that is novel in comparison to published literature
  - Statement on how findings are reproducible in other centers should be included
  - Provide information on strengths and weaknesses of the study
  - A definitive conclusion as to what should be the change in practice or future directions of the field based on findings should be provided
Performing a Review

• **References**
  
  - Assure that majority of references are current
  - Confirm that references are of the original study rather than of a secondary publication
  - References should not be exhaustive on a particular topic
  - Confirm that references are not repetitive
  - Confirm that reference numbers from Tables or Figures match those in reference list
Reviewer Decisions

• **Accept**
  - No changes required of the authors and manuscript will be accepted exactly as it has been submitted (NOT RECOMMENDED)

• **Minor Revisions**
  - Authors have met most of the criteria as mentioned above
  - Required information is easily attainable by authors
  - Minimal changes required in any or all portions of the manuscript
  - Minor edits on language and grammar
Reviewer Decisions

• **Major Revisions**
  
  - Substantial changes required in the manuscript but with consideration for publication provided those changes are addressed by authors
  - Major additional information is requested of the authors but within feasibility for the authors
  - Requirement for re-analysis of portions or entirety of the data
  - Substantial changes to the Discussion requiring a different interpretation of the data to conform to the analysis and presentation of such data
  - Significant language or grammatical edits required (*consideration for IJGC Medical Editor*)
Reviewer Decisions

• **Reject**

- Manuscript presents a topic that has been previously published in either a larger cohort of patients or prospective trial with very similar results
- Methodology is inadequate to answer the question proposed
- Results do not reflect or support the proposed methodology or are incongruent with the primary objective
- Interpretation of the data is not supported by the Results of the study
- Data that has been previously published
- Conflict of interest with promotion of drug or product
- Major concerns of plagiarism from prior work
- Grammar and language is not considered appropriate even beyond consideration of edits by Medical Editor
Items to Avoid as Reviewer

• Do not make any statement to the author as to whether the manuscript should be accepted or rejected
• Do not request information that is logistically not possible to obtain based on nature of the study
• Do not make any personal criticism of the author(s)
• Transfer responsibility as a Reviewer to someone else (medical student, residents or fellows) without providing direct supervision and oversight of the review provided by such individual
• Refrain from imparting personal bias onto the review
• Under no circumstance should Reviewer make the contents of the manuscript submitted for review public nor discuss unpublished material
• A Reviewer should never accept a manuscript for review when there is a clear conflict of interest either in favor or against the data or group submitting the manuscript
Terms from the IJGC

• Identity of the Reviewer will not be revealed to any author
• Reviewers will not be asked (unless in very unique circumstances) to re-review a manuscript once authors have addressed their comments
• Reviewers will not be asked to secure additional Reviewers for a manuscript
• The IJGC will not make public the personal performance ratings (scores) of Reviewers
Resources

COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers
http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines

COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines
http://publicationethics.org/resources/code-conduct
Thank you!
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